

**REPORT/RECOMMENDATION TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
OF SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA
AND RECORD OF ACTION**

December 5, 2006

FROM: **MICHAEL E. HAYS**, Director
 Land Use Services Department

SUBJECT: CONDUCT A WORKSHOP ON THE GENERAL PLAN UPDATE PROGRAM

RECOMMENDATION:

- 1) Conduct a workshop regarding the General Plan Update Program including: the General Plan goals, policies and maps; the preparation of 13 community plans; a complete revision to Title 8 of the San Bernardino County Code (the Development Code); and the Final Environmental Impact Report;
- 2) Provide staff with direction regarding any changes to the program documents; and
- 3) Continue the workshop to December 12, 2006.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION: Two workshops have been scheduled for the Board of Supervisors (Board) to review the General Plan Update (GPU) Program prior to a public hearing scheduled for December 19th to consider adoption. The workshops are organized to provide an overview of the four major components of the update program: two components per workshop. The December 5th workshop will focus on the General Plan and the Community Plans, The December 12th workshop will focus on the Development Code and the Environmental Impact Report.

The Board authorized the General Plan Update in 2001 as a two phase program. The first phase was a strategic analysis of the 1989 General Plan, as amended. The Phase I analysis was designed to provide recommendations for Board consideration. The Board's endorsement of a final set of recommendations was intended to define the scope of work for the preparation of the new General Plan (Phase II). The consultant hired to prepare the Phase I analysis identified 18 specific recommendations to guide the Phase II Update. The consultants also performed an initial evaluation of all existing goals and policies in the 1989 Plan. The Board adopted those recommendations with minor adjustments. The Board also endorsed important additional tasks that included reinstating Community Plans that were eliminated in 1989, completing a comprehensive revision to the County's Development Code to modernize and streamline the document, and provide focused zoning-level analysis in the West Fontana and Mentone areas, two rapidly growing areas that have never undergone comprehensive review. The Phase I Evaluation also made process-oriented recommendations that called for a public involvement process that included extensive public meetings throughout the County and established a General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC) made up of community members to represent a broad

Page 1 of 8

Record of Action of the Board of Supervisors

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
WORKSHOP ON THE GENERAL PLAN UPDATE PROGRAM
PAGE 2 OF 8**

cross-section of County unincorporated areas. The Phase I Evaluation Report was used to define the scope of services for a contract to assist staff with the update program.

Phase II General Plan Update Process

Phase II of the San Bernardino County General Plan Update (GPU) was launched in the summer of 2003 following award of a contract to the planning consulting firm of URS Corporation. The contract included a specific scope of work that responded to the recommendations of the Phase I Evaluation. The scope of work outlined a three-year planning process that provided for significant public involvement. The scope of work also identified the following specific work products that would result from the planning effort:

- A Vision Statement
- Background Reports for each General Plan Element
- 13 Community Plans
- Draft Goals and Policies Report
- Updated General Plan
- Updated Development Code
- Environmental Impact Report.

Public Participation – the foundation to the General Plan Update

Extensive public participation has been a hallmark of this General Plan Update. Numerous community meetings were held during the early months of the program to establish a foundation for preparation of a Vision Statement. Further community meetings were included in the Community Plan process and monthly meetings of the GPAC, which were open to the public, were held from June 2003 to April 2006. In all, there were 23 community meetings for the visioning process, 35 community meetings and 18 committee meetings during preparation of the Community Plans, and 30 GPAC meetings.

PRODUCTS OF THE GENERAL PLAN UPDATE

Vision Statement

The first step in the GPU process involved the preparation of a Vision Statement. The purpose of the Vision Statement was to provide guidance in developing General Plan goals and set a frame of reference for the General Plan and its related components. The vision for the General Plan was prepared using extensive public outreach. Public outreach provided an opportunity to “get the word out” about the General Plan Update and collect information from County residents regarding important attributes about San Bernardino County that should be retained or improved through the General Plan. The Board of Supervisors adopted the Vision Statement in 2004. The goals and policies of the General Plan, the Development Code, and the Community Plans have been drafted to help achieve the vision for the future of the County.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
WORKSHOP ON THE GENERAL PLAN UPDATE PROGRAM
PAGE 3 OF 8**

Preparation of Background Reports

In order to provide both an initial reference point and a technical source of data for the GPU, Background Reports were prepared for each of the seven mandatory elements and one optional element of the General Plan. These Background Reports provide the environmental, institutional and legal setting for the preparation of the General Plan and associated documents.

Preparation of Community Plans

Another key component of the General Plan is the 13 Community Plans, which have been prepared for selected communities. The Community Plans identify goals and policies that are unique to each particular community. The Phase I Evaluation of the General Plan Update recommended that Community Plans be reinstated as a planning component of the General Plan framework to provide community-specific development guidance within these 13 communities. Community Plans focus on recognized, intact communities that are experiencing, or are anticipated to experience, growth pressures. Community Plans must be consistent with the General Plan. Community Plans build upon the goals and policies of each element of the General Plan. Community Plan goals and policies have been customized to meet the specific needs or unique circumstances of individual communities. The goals and policies within Community Plans guide development in a manner that maintains the existing balance of land uses, preserves the character of the community, and complements existing development. To aid County staff and the consultants, Advisory Committees were established for each Community Plan area. These committees provided invaluable assistance in formulating the community goals and policies and facilitating public input into each plan. The following are the proposed Community Plans within the unincorporated areas of the County:

Bear Valley
Bloomington
Crest Forest
Hilltop
Homestead Valley
Joshua Tree
Lake Arrowhead

Lucerne Valley
Lytle Creek
Morongo Valley
Muscoy
Oak Glen
Phelan/Pinon Hills

A fourteenth plan, the Oak Hills Community Plan, was adopted as part of a joint effort with the City of Hesperia in 2003. Since this plan is already in effect, the format of the plan is all that needs to be amended to be consistent with the 13 new plans that have been prepared. Once the General Plan Update documents have been formally adopted, the Oak Hills Community Plan will be amended to achieve this consistency in format.

Draft Goals and Policies Report

The Phase I Evaluation recommended that, in order to satisfy the objectives of the Board, the organization of the new General Plan should format the goals and policies according to the seven state-required General Plan elements: Land Use, Circulation and Infrastructure, Housing, Conservation, Open Space, Noise and Safety. In addition, consistent with the Phase I

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
WORKSHOP ON THE GENERAL PLAN UPDATE PROGRAM
PAGE 4 OF 8**

recommendations, an Economic Development Element was included as an elective element for the Plan. The Draft Goals and Policies Report was prepared to facilitate an initial review of a comprehensive set of updated goals and policies by the GPAC and the public. Following the GPAC's acceptance of the report, it was subsequently presented to the Planning Commission for consideration. The Draft Goals and Policies Report was ultimately made available to the Board of Supervisors. In addition, the draft goals and policies contained in the report were presented with annotations that referenced their origin, i.e. re-written from the 1989 General Plan, based on the Vision Statement, or in response to a legal requirement. The annotation format will be carried forward through the hearing process until final adoption by the Board to provide for continuing reference as needed. After the Board has adopted the plan, these references will be deleted.

Updated General Plan

The State of California requires each city and county to prepare and adopt a general plan to identify goals, policies and programs to guide future development of that jurisdiction. Each general plan in the state is required to address a variety of issues through the preparation of elements, or chapters, organized by topic. The seven required elements were listed above. The County last prepared an update of the County's General Plan in 1989. Since its adoption, the General Plan has been amended on numerous occasions to accommodate land use designation changes as well as policy changes.

The update to the General Plan provides a projection of growth in the County through the year 2030. Text, tables and maps in the draft General Plan identify goals and policies that will guide the development of residential, commercial, industrial, public facilities, transportation facilities and other uses that are desired by the public and decision makers. The consultant team hired to prepare the General Plan Update documents included the firm of Stanley R. Hoffman Associates, Inc. which conducted a detailed analysis of the build-out capacity of the 1989 General Plan relative to residential densities and non-residential building intensities for the unincorporated areas of the County. This firm also analyzed population growth trends and computed estimated totals for population, the number of households and employment opportunities for the year 2030. These figures were critical in analyzing potential impacts on the environment associated with the increased population and preparing measures to mitigate these impacts. Another consultant, John Husing of Economics and Politics, Inc., prepared an Economic Development Report that was the basis for the development of the Economic Development Element of the General Plan. The forecasts presented in the Husing report enabled staff and the consultant team to compose viable goals and policies relative to economic development that link to the Economic Strategy adopted by the Board of Supervisors in 2005.

Updated Development Code

The proposed San Bernardino Development Code (Title 8 of the County Code) would replace the existing Development Code in its entirety. The Development Code implements the goals and policies of the General Plan by classifying and regulating the uses of land and structures within the County. The purpose of the Development Code is to promote and protect the public health, safety and general welfare of County residents. The Development Code is the mechanism that implements the County General Plan, including policies contained in the various Community

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
WORKSHOP ON THE GENERAL PLAN UPDATE PROGRAM
PAGE 5 OF 8**

Plans. To satisfy one of the overall objectives of the Board, the Development Code has been rewritten to modernize the document to be more understandable and user-friendly.

General Plan EIR

The final critical step in the GPU process is the preparation of the EIR. The Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the Draft EIR was released on October 5, 2005. The purpose of the NOP was to provide a description of the GPU process, to provide information on the environmental issues which the County identified for analysis in the draft EIR, and to seek input on the environmental analysis that would be conducted by the County. Three scoping meetings were held in late October 2005 for the purpose of soliciting input from the public regarding any specific issues which anyone felt the EIR should address. Since that time, the Draft EIR has been completed and was released on September 8, 2006 for public review and comment. The comment period ended on October 23, 2006, and responses to all comments have been prepared for inclusion in the Final Environmental Impact Report.

WORKSHOP FOCUS

The revised General Plan text is a compilation of those current General Plan goals and policies that have been determined to be essential for inclusion in the update and those new goals and policies that have been developed based on the adopted Vision Statement. Most of the goals and policies contained in the General Plan apply countywide. However, staff has also tailored some goals and policies that apply only to one or two of the regions of the County – Valley, Mountain or Desert. For example, the goals and policies relative to the preservation of the night sky apply only to the Mountain and Desert Regions. The next step down from these regional goals and policies is found in the Community Plans which are intended to be focused on and applied to just those local areas.

HIGHLIGHTS OF THE NEW GENERAL PLAN TEXT

The following is a summary of the “new look” of the General Plan:

- Goals and policies have been added to implement the adopted Vision Statement.
- The text has been organized by element.
- The volume of the plan has been reduced by removing technical standards and guidelines that should not be included in a General Plan and by removing ineffective goals and policies.
- An Economic Development Element has been added to the plan.
- The General Plan Implementation Guide identifies a responsible entity for implementation of all policies and programs.
- An analysis of the 2030 forecasted traffic volumes has been conducted and goals and policies pertaining to this analysis have been included in the plan.
- The mapped Improvement Level concept has been eliminated and replaced by Infrastructure Standards that have been added to the Development Code. These standards are based on the density and intensity of the use.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
WORKSHOP ON THE GENERAL PLAN UPDATE PROGRAM
PAGE 6 OF 8**

- Planning Areas are being eliminated and replaced by expanding the goals and policies of the three regional areas of the County (Valley, Mountain and Desert) and by the adoption of 13 Community Plans.

HIGHLIGHTS OF THE GENERAL PLAN MAPPING

- **General Changes**
 - Removed all obsolete zoning “prefixes” and “suffixes”;
 - Revised all residential land use designations into a standardized list of minimum lot sizes for the Agriculture, Rural Living, and Single Family Residential designations;
 - RS • RS-1 • RL-10 • AG-20
 - RS-10M • RM • RL-20 • AG-40
 - RS-14M • RL • RL-40 • AG-80
 - RS-20M • RL-5 • AG • AG-160
 - Changed all Planned Development (PD) designations to Specific Development (SD) with either a residential or commercial suffix.
- **Community Plans**
 - Minor zoning changes were made in various community plans to respond to issues raised in the plan preparation and public review processes.
- **"Hotspot" Analyses for West Fontana and Mentone**
 - Zoning changes were made to address land use compatibility and to bring existing land uses into conformity with the land use zoning districts in which they are located. Both areas lie within the spheres of influence of adjoining cities, West Fontana within the sphere of the City of Fontana and Mentone within the sphere of the City of Redlands. These zoning changes also align the County's zoning with the pre-zoning designations assigned by the cities to the extent practicable. These changes recognize the existing subdivision patterns and bring consistency between the jurisdictions.
- **Sphere Areas**
 - Several zoning changes were made to bring the County zoning into conformance with the various cities' pre-zoning for the areas in question and to address specific issues raised in the process of preparing the GPU.
- **Miscellaneous**
 - Minor zoning changes were made along the I-40.
 - Open Space designations were applied to appropriate lands in the unincorporated area north of the City of Rancho Cucamonga and in the Morongo Valley Community Plan area.

HIGHLIGHTS OF THE COMMUNITY PLANS

Valley Region

- Bloomington Community Plan: Key concerns in this community are preserving examples of a rural lifestyle by maintaining areas of low-density residential development, generally south of the I-10 Freeway, while also accommodating higher density, more urban housing opportunities, increasing commercial development to meet the needs of a diverse and growing population; maintaining an equestrian-friendly environment with small agriculture and animal-raising opportunities; providing a network of public and private open space,

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
WORKSHOP ON THE GENERAL PLAN UPDATE PROGRAM
PAGE 7 OF 8**

trail corridors and facilities for active and passive recreation; and ensuring adequate infrastructure commensurate with meeting the community needs.

- Muscoy Community Plan: Key concerns include a desire to retain the rural character of the community by maintaining primarily low-density residential development west of State Street; providing agricultural and animal raising opportunities and an equestrian-friendly environment; and providing opportunities for commercial development that serves the needs of local residents. Future pressures for more urbanized type development was recognized as an inevitable consequence of the easterly extension of the 210 Freeway and an interchange at State Street that will provide north-south circulation linkage to the 215 and the State University area.

Mountain Region

- Bear Valley Community Plan: Key concerns in this community are to provide adequate infrastructure and services, promote economic development that can sustain the mountain community character and maintain a balance between the needs of community residents and tourists.
- Crest Forest Community Plan: Key concerns include a desire to maintain low-density residential development, to enhance existing commercial services and facilities to meet the frequently reoccurring needs of residents and visitors of the community, and to expand the recreation opportunities, trails systems, and open space areas located on both public and private lands for residents and visitors.
- Hilltop Community Plan: Key concerns include the desire to maintain low-density residential development, and to expand recreation opportunities, trails systems and open space areas located on both public and private lands. Some minor land use zoning district changes are being proposed in the Green Valley Lake area. Certain properties that are currently General Commercial are proposed to be changed back to the residential designation they had prior to the 1985 Community Plan.
- Lake Arrowhead Community Plan: Key issues include a desire to preserve the alpine character of the area by maintaining low-density residential development, and to protect the scenic and natural resources, including Lake Arrowhead, which symbolizes the community character and quality of life of residents and visitors. A letter was received recently from a sub-committee of the Community Plan Advisory Committee. The letter is included in Attachment 8 to the staff report.
- Lytle Creek Community Plan: A key issue in this community is a willingness to share this unique area with non-residents and to make available to them facilities and services, provided the facilities and services benefit the local people as well as visitors, are compatible with the natural environment and surrounding uses, and support conservation of the natural resources valued by community residents.
- Oak Glen Community Plan: Key issues include preserving the rural character of the community by maintaining agricultural activities, low-density residential development and limited commercial development by balancing the preservation of the rural character while providing for local jobs and businesses through agritourism opportunities.

Desert Region

- Homestead Valley Community Plan: A key concern in this community is to retain the primarily low density, rural residential desert character of this plan area. Other important

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
WORKSHOP ON THE GENERAL PLAN UPDATE PROGRAM
PAGE 8 OF 8**

issues include commercial uses along Highway 247 in the central Landers area, as well as adequate circulation and road standards.

- Joshua Tree Community Plan: Key concerns include maintaining the identity of Joshua Tree as the gateway to the Joshua Tree National Park. Additional concerns include finding a balance between the need for infrastructure such as roads and water, and the desire to conserve natural resources and maintain the desert character, along with the development of a viable town center for local businesses.
- Lucerne Valley Community Plan: Key concerns include maintaining and preserving the quality of the desert while allowing for economic development to provide greater opportunities for local jobs.
- Morongo Valley Community Plan: Key issues include assuring that there are adequate and reliable sources of potable water, as well as the encouragement of commercial growth in the center of the community along Highway 62, while maintaining the existing character of the desert and maintenance of low density development in the majority of the community.
- Phelan/Pinon Hills Community Plan: Key issues include maintaining the rural residential desert character of these two communities along with assuring that the communities have adequate and reliable potable water supplies, expanding recreation and dedicated open space, adequate commercial services to support local community needs and enhancing business opportunities.

REVIEW BY OTHERS: This item has been reviewed by County Counsel (Robin Cochran, Deputy County Counsel, 387-8957) on _____ and County Administrative Office (Daniel R. Kopp, Administrative Analyst, 387-3828) on _____.

FINANCIAL IMPACT: There are no financial impacts for this workshop.

SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICT(S): All Supervisorial Districts

PRESENTER: Randy Scott, Deputy Director of Land Use Services Department, Advance Planning